

Date: Mon, 8 Feb 93 04:30:24 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #33  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Mon, 8 Feb 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    33

Today's Topics:

                    Abandonment of CW  
                    License Requirements?  
    What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses? (5 msgs)  
        You may still be asked to send code! (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: 5 Feb 93 18:39:03 GMT  
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Abandonment of CW  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> Congratulations! You are one of the few Extra class higher-ups who realizes  
> the futility of CW wpm requirements. As for me, I still have trouble with  
> 5wpm!

Nonsense! Many of the most stident no-code proponents are Extra class hams.  
I did 20 WPM because it was there. While I operate CW, I'm nowhere near that  
fast in real life (I can do 13 solid). Frankly the \*ONLY\* reason the requirement  
is there is to make it HARD to get to the Extra class. Frankly,  
I'd support another way to demonstrate "EXTRA" than CW.

-Ron (W02L)

-----

Date: 5 Feb 93 17:34:59 PDT  
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!sdd.hp.com!crash!simpack!  
dsmith@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: License Requirements?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I apologize if this is a frequently asked question, but I have not kept up with this news group or even with amateur radio for a long time.

I used to have a Technician License WB7PET back in the 70s. What is the current policy for getting a new license? I assume that I have to take the test and pass a CW test. I seem to remember hearing that the tests can now be administered by another HAM instead of the FCC. Is this so? Also, what are the CW rates required for the different levels?

E-mail answers would be appreciated, but I will try to read here for follow-up.

Thanks,  
Dave Smith

-----  
Date: 6 Feb 93 11:08:59 EDT  
From: sdd.hp.com!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!news.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!hyperion!  
antioc.antioch.edu!dkstein@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Feb5.193240.773@VFL.Paramax.COM>, rossi@gvlf9-q.gvl.unisys.com (Pete Rossi) writes:

> What mechanism does the FCC and VECs have to prevent someone from  
> obtaining more than one amateur license?

Why would anyone want two or more amateur licences? I barely want the one I've got

As far as I can see, there is nothing preventing the actions you suggest except good sense.

P. G. Stein, K2RCG, Official observer Coordinator, ARRL SNJ Section  
(please reply to 73377.335@compuserve.com

>

=====

-----  
Date: 5 Feb 93 19:32:40 GMT

From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!gatech!pitt.edu!gvls1!gvlf9-q!  
rossi@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

What mechanism does the FCC and VECs have to prevent someone from  
obtaining more than one amateur license?

I was talking with a friend the other day and we came up with the following:

WHAT IF... A licensed amateur (let's say he has an extra) were to go down  
to his local VE testing center where his is unknown, and takes (for example)  
a no-code Tech test. Fills in the application with either the same name and  
address on his current license, uses a different address, or maybe uses a  
variation of his name (missing middle name, etc). Do VEs really check that  
closely?

What would happen? Is there anything that would prevent it from slipping  
through the cracks and a second license showing up in his mailbox?

It becomes more interesting if the person has two residences and could  
come up with legal forms of ID that had a different address.

ORIGINAL -> W3XYZ John M. Smith EXTRA 123 Main Street Anytown, USA.

COPY -> N3XAA J. Michael Smith TECHNICIAN 123 Main Street Anytown USA

COPY -> N3XBB John M. Smith TECHNICIAN 456 Other Street Somewhere USA

Except for having the same birthday, how would anyone know or even  
suspect that they were all actually the same person? I wonder if  
it has ever been done?

=====  
Pete Rossi - WA3NNA rossie@VFL.Paramax.COM

Paramax Systems Corporation - a Unisys Company  
Electronic Systems - Valley Forge Engineering Center - Paoli, Pennsylvania  
=====

-----

Date: 6 Feb 93 18:39:05 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!hri.com!noc.near.net!lynx!lkay@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu



From: sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!agate!dog.ee.lbl.gov!hellgate.utah.edu!cc.usu.edu!  
slp9m@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Feb5.193240.773@VFL.Paramax.COM>, rossi@gvlf9-q.gvl.unisys.com  
(Pete Rossi) writes:

> What mechanism does the FCC and VECs have to prevent someone from  
> obtaining more than one amateur license?  
>

[scenario deleted]

I almost posted the same question a couple of years ago. I thought I had found  
a loophole which would permit me to keep my old call PLUS get a (possibly)  
better pileup/contest call - by taking the tests again and getting a second  
ticket. But alas, it is illegal. Before posting the question I did my  
homework and the prohibition clearly spelled out in part 97 (somewhere, I don't  
remember the paragraph off the top of my head).

Now, you might get away with it. My suspicion is that you probably would. But  
then, if you have to keep it hush-hush, you've defeated the whole purpose of  
doing it in the first place. At least in my case. To use the second call in  
the way I hoped to would mean that both calls would be very much identified  
with my radio activity and hence with me. It just wouldn't work.

73, -SEP

---

Scott E. Parker	WA7VYJ	\	INTERNET: SLP9M@cc.usu.edu
Center for Atmospheric & Space Sciences		\	Twisted pair: (801) 750-2975
Utah State University		\	Home: (801) 753-3924
Logan, UT	84322-4405	\	

---

-----  
Date: Mon, 8 Feb 1993 06:32:56 GMT  
From: news.acns.nwu.edu!merle.acns.nwu.edu!hpa@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Feb5.193240.773@VFL.Paramax.COM> of rec.radio.amateur.policy,  
rossi@gvlf9-q.gvl.unisys.com (Pete Rossi) writes:

> What mechanism does the FCC and VECs have to prevent someone from  
> obtaining more than one amateur license?

There is no problem at all getting two different call signs, as long  
as you get them in different countries, and those countries don't have

any special agreements to the contrary (which I believe the USA and Canada do). Look at my sig file for an example. But that might not have been what you meant?

/hpa

--

INTERNET: hpa@nwu.edu TALK: hpa@merle.acns.nwu.edu  
BITNET: HPA@NUACC IBMNET: 16331@IBMX400  
HAM RADIO: N9ITP SM4TKN NeXTMAIL: hpa@speedy.acns.nwu.edu  
"Kissing a smoker is like licking an ashtray." -- R. Heinlein

-----  
Date: 5 Feb 93 20:05:07 GMT  
From: news.service.uci.edu!ucivax!news.claremont.edu!bridge2!sgiblab!pacbell.com!  
att-out!walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: You may still be asked to send code!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <9302050341.AA03133@netmail.microsoft.com> a-kevinp@microsoft.COM  
(Kevin Purcell, Rho) writes:

>I was reading Part 97 (nothing like a good read to find the weirdities  
>in this document) and I came across this near the back of the book:  
>  
>97.509 Administering and Examination  
>  
>(b) Each examinee must comply with the instructions given by the  
>administering VEs.  
>  
>(d) Passing a telegraphy examination is adequate proof of an examinee's  
>ability to send and receive telegraphy. The administering VEs,  
>however, MAY ALSO INCLUDE A SENDING SEGMENT IN A TELEGRAPHY EXAMINATION.  
>  
>[My emphasis].  
>  
>Questions:  
>  
>1. Does the first sentence imply that if you can pass the receiving  
>test then it doesn't matter if you can send a single dit.

Yes. I know of no testing for one's ability to send being done for any of the VE testing I've heard about in the northeast. The reality is that if you can copy 13wpm, most people can then send at 13+ without any effort.

>2. Can a VE fail you if you refuse to send any code (on the basis of  
>97.509 (b))? "What's that thing ... I can't do that" :-)

That would appear to be the case.

>3. Has anyone see a VE give a sending test?

No, see my answer to #1.

>What do they ARRL and W5YI VEC rule books say?

Since they are both followed by different VE sessions locally, I'll hazard a guess that neither encourages doing a "send" test as well as a receive test.

>This could be a boon for the "this ain't like my test at the FCC >office" OFs :-)

Why, this is the way the tests have been done for the past several years. Sure it isn't anything like the old FCC test environment, but I don't think it means anything.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

-----  
Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)  
Morristown, NJ                      email via UUCP              bcr!cc!whs70  
201-829-2879 Weekdays            email via Internet    whs70@cc.bellcore.com

-----  
Date: 6 Feb 93 05:43:19 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.cs.columbia.edu!  
popovich@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: You may still be asked to send code!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Well, the ARRL VE Manual seems to actively discourage it, except in the case of a handicapped individual (!?). Take a look at this. Text in brackets is mine, not theirs.

-----  
Sending Tests. Section 97.509(d) states that passing a telegraphy receiving examination is adequate proof of an examinee's ability to both send and receive telegraphy. The administering VEs, however, may also include a sending segment in a telegraphy examination --  
[Nit-pick: In the printed manual, that previous double dash is split across two lines. Who formats these things?] but it is not required. Therefore, based on this FCC recommendation, ARRL/VEC teams administer only receiving tests and do not require sending tests.

A sending test may be used as an accommodation for a handicapped individual. As mentioned earlier, the examination may be administered by allowing the examinee to send using a key, keyer or other similar device -- a computer keyboard is not acceptable, however. Sending texts may be requested from the VEC for this purpose, or the VE Team may create their own -- or use one of our standard texts from our Morse code tapes.

In an accommodated sending test for a handicapped individual, the VEs must decide whether the candidate has maintained the required 5, 13 or 20 WPM character speed. Spacing between the characters, since this is an accommodated exam, is not being judged. Depending on the severity of a particular handicap, while some candidates can maintain a high sending speed, others may only be able to demonstrate single characters -- and even those characters may be extremely difficult for the candidate to accomplish. The minimum sending test may be limited to include only the FCC's required 43 characters sent randomly, as administered by the examiners. For extreme cases, a passing grade can be based upon a 70-percent accurate demonstration of ability.

The examiners [sic] decision should be based upon the candidates [sic] ability to comprehend the Morse code message by overcoming the handicap through an accommodated means.

-----

Now, that is a thoroughly strange thing to say. First off, since the same book gives procedures for completely exempting handicapped candidates from the 13 and 20 WPM code exams, what's the point of even having a procedure for an accommodated code test for any speed but 5 WPM? I can't imagine what sort of handicap would be severe enough to need accommodation on a 13 or 20 WPM code exam but would also not be severe enough to merit exemption from the 13 and 20 WPM code exams. Perhaps I'm missing something here.

Second, the accommodated code test does NOT demonstrate the ability to either send or receive code at even 5 WPM. Only individual characters, rather than any appreciable number of consecutive characters, need be sent. In fact, it's acceptable to pass somebody who can't send 30 percent of the characters, even when given unlimited time to produce one character at the proper character speed! The idea of using single character speeds as the testing criterion, rather than a sustained sending speed, is also a bit problematical, especially for the 5 WPM test. If somebody can only send a single character at 5 WPM, then has to recover, I can only surmise that he won't be using CW much on the air. If the FCC allows this, I don't see why they don't go that one more logical step and exempt handicapped people from code tests altogether. They've already broken the treaty by not requiring



a sending test for everybody. Remember, the treaty requires sending AND receiving examinations. It doesn't matter that 99% of people who can receive at a given rate can send at that rate. If there's even one person out there who can receive the code, but not send it, then the FCC has broken the treaty. Actually, I think I've met a couple of those people on the air. They copied my call just fine, but when they answered, they had such a swing on their fists that they were impossible to copy. The only way to avoid a getting a headache from trying to copy their wretched code was to say 73 immediately. And the FCC has bent their own rules into a pretzel by allowing accommodated code exams based on character speeds, rather than sustained speeds. Since the ability to send or receive single characters at a given speed says nothing about your ability to use the code at that speed in real time, if you're going to allow such exams to be used to satisfy the code test requirements, why not just chuck the code tests entirely? In fact, chuck them for everybody, not just handicapped people. Then maybe we could find better uses for our time than blathering about no-codes :-).

Finally, the phrasing of that last paragraph is simply weird. We're talking about SENDING tests here, but for some reason the examiners' decision should be based upon the candidate's ability to COMPREHEND the Morse code message. It seems that for a sending test, if anybody has to be able to comprehend the Morse code message, it's the examiner and not the candidate :-). If it's sending we're testing, who cares whether the CANDIDATE comprehends the message?

-----

Date: Sat, 6 Feb 1993 20:18:12 GMT  
From: sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!cbnewsc!cbfsb!cbnewsb.cb.att.com!  
wa2ise@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: You may still be asked to send code!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>>This could be a boon for the "this ain't like my test at the FCC  
>>office" OFs :-)

>

>Why, this is the way the tests have been done for the past several  
>years. Sure it isn't anything like the old FCC test environment,  
>but I don't think it means anything.

Couldn't resist: I'm 6 months from being an OF (I'm 39.5), and "I had to send code at the FCC test office somewhere in NYC." Remember the place was painted a yucky shade of dirty green. And someone wrote "FCC = Funny Cookie Corporation" on the back of the mens room door. The person doing the tests graded the exams before I left, and told me I passed. And you'll get it in a few months. Took test towards

the end of Aug '76, found out my call a week before Thanksgiving '76.  
Time delay seems similar to what we have lately (+- a few weeks).

;-)

-----  
Date: Fri, 5 Feb 1993 18:39:41 GMT  
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!gatech!  
asuvax!ennews!anasaz!john@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan30.004752.8147@anomaly.sbs.com>,  
<1993Jan30.160622.4612@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU>,  
<1kjm6uINN2sa@west.West.Sun.COM>@  
Reply-To : john@anasazi.com  
Subject : Re: Net Control Signing for others on Net

Keywords:

In article <1kjm6uINN2sa@west.West.Sun.COM> flloyd@l1-a.West.Sun.COM (Fred Lloyd  
[Phoenix SE]) writes:

]

]In article <1993Jan30.160622.4612@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU>

jeg7e@livia.acs.Virginia.EDU (John E. Gefaell) writes:

]This sort of itinerant check in, report and leave activity is

]very well suited by the "Back to net control, AA7BQ" type of ID.

]In fact, there is no other way to do it and still be in compliance

]with the rules.

]

]

]>Thus repeated identification is not only unnecessary and silly, it is also

]>detrimental to the net.

]

]Yes, to \_your\_ structured net. Not, however, to my open net.

Another problem is on a net such as the Hurricane Watch Net where the  
urgency of the traffic, and the large number of stations, makes it  
impossible for net control to give everyone a chance to sign every  
10 minutes. On that net, when I am not net control, I normally say  
"NJ7E back to net" when I am through with a conversation on the net.  
Otherwise, I'm not going to have a chance to ID within the 10 minute  
limit. Furthermore, "NJ7E back to net" only takes a couple of seconds.

As net control on that net, I don't have the time to keep track of  
who needs to ID - at least when a hurricane is generating a lot of  
traffic and is also getting a lot of press.

Far more important than trivia about exact wording of net procedure is teaching hams to disconnect their mikes when listening to such a net. Too many times we have idiots who haven't been listening long enough to know procedure, and who have no concept of the difference between emergency and heal-and-welfare traffic, jump in when they shouldn't. If everyone except designated net controls, relays and stations in the affected area would just shut up, the net would move about 3 times as fast.

--

John Moore NJ7E, 7525 Clearwater Pkwy, Scottsdale, AZ 85253 (602-951-9326)  
john@anasazi.com ncar!noao!asuvax!anasaz!john anasaz!john@asuvax.eas.asu.edu

- - A conservative is a liberal who has been mugged by reality! - -
- - Support ALL of the bill of rights, INCLUDING the 2nd amendment! - -

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #33

\*\*\*\*\*